



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

Studies in Semitic Grammar.*—By FRANK R. BLAKE, Ph.D.,
Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, Md.

I. Apparent Interchange between ה and נ in Semitic.

There are quite a number of cases in the Semitic languages where we find cognate words or forms appearing now with ה and now with נ. Sometimes both forms occur in the same language, sometimes ה appears in one and נ in another. For example, we have in Hebrew both אֵךְ and הֵךְ 'how'; in Biblical Aramaic הֵן, in Arabic إِنْ 'if'; in Hebrew and Biblical Aramaic, a causative with preformative ה, in Arabic, Ethiopic, and Syriac, one with preformative נ.

Some of these changes are undoubtedly phonetic, i. e., due to the operation of some law of simple sound change, as, e. g., is the Cockney interchange between *h* and the glottal catch; or resulting from the combination of sounds that the word presents.

The most important cases of phonetic interchange of *h* and ' are the following:¹

- a) In Assyrian an original Semitic *h* regularly becomes ', e. g., Heb. הָלַךְ. Ass. *alâku* 'go'.
- b) An initial ' seems to have become *h* in some Old Arabic dialects, e. g., *hin*, *hiîaka*, *hamâ* for أَمَّا, إِيَّاكَ, إِنْ.
- c) In some Aramaic dialects and in modern Syrian Arabic an ' is dissimilated to *h* on account of the presence of another ' in the word, e. g., Syr. Ar. *ha'rab* < 'a'rab < اقرب 'bring near', Syriac ܬܬܐܬܐ < ḥetâ'â (*t* = *t'*) 'sin', Mandaic *hattiqâ* < 'attiqâ (*q* = *k'*) 'old'.

* This article was first put in type by the printers of this Journal in the summer of 1915. See the Note on page 319.

¹ Cf. Delitzsch, *Assyrische Gram.*² § 52, and Brockelmann, *Grundriss d. vergl. Gram. d. semitischen Sprachen*, vol. i, pp. 45, 240, 242f.

Many of the cases of interchange between *h* and *'*, however, are apparently not phonetic, but result from special causes in each case, among which analogy plays a very important part.

The chief cases of this apparent interchange are the following, viz.:—

- a) Heb. הַיֵּךְ, הַיֵּךְ 'how': here **ח** is the original consonant, ה of הַיֵּךְ being due to analogy of the interrogative particle הַיֵּ. Similarly the Targumic interrogatives הַיֵּךְ, הַיֵּךְ 'which' for הַיֵּךְ, הַיֵּךְ which also occur, are probably the result of the same analogy.
- b) Syr. ܐܢܬܐ, ܐܢܬܐ and ܐܢܬܐ, ܐܢܬܐ 'they': the difference in initials may be due to confusion between personal pronouns with ה initial and a series of accusative forms consisting of the particle ܐܢ + suffix, such as occurs in Talmudic ܐܢܬܐ, ܐܢܬܐ 'them';¹ or, inasmuch as the forms with **ח** are employed as verbal object, the ה may have become **ח** or been lost completely after an immediately preceding verb, as, e. g., in English, 'I saw 'im (him)'.
- c) Arab. ٱ, Heb. and Bib. Aram. ה, interrogative particles: two different particles,² perhaps ultimately identical in primitive Semitic.
- d) Hebr. ִאם, Syr. ܐܢܬܐ, Arab. ٱ, Eth. ገመ ገemma, Bib. Aram. ܐܢ 'if': the ה of Bib. Aram. is due to the influence of the interrogative particle ה or perhaps is a combination of this particle and ܐܢ (cf. Hebr. ִאם), the change originating in the case of 'in 'whether' in the indirect question.
- e) Arab. ٱ, Heb. ܐܢܬܐ, 'behold'; **ח** is original, ה is due to the influence of demonstrative particle *hā*.³
- f) Hebr. ܐܢܬܐ, Bib. Aram. ܐܢܬܐ, Syr. ܐܢܬܐ, ܐܢܬܐ 'then': **ח** is original, the ה of the Syriac forms is probably due to

¹ Cf. Barth, *Pronominalbildung*, Leipzig, 1913, p. 19.

² **ח** as interrogative particle seems to occur in ܐܢܬܐ 'verily' = ܐܢܬܐ, and perhaps in some other particles, cf. my paper *The Interrogative Particle ܐܢ in Hebrew*, *AJSL*, vol. xxxiii, No. 2, Jan. 1917, pp. 146-148.

³ So Brockelmann, *Grundriss*, vol. i, p. 501 a. In Hebrew the *ê* of ܐܢ instead of *â* is perhaps due to the analogy of the synonymous particle ܐܢܬܐ.

some analogy with the demonstrative pronouns with initial ה, הָ, הַ 'this' etc. What the *i* is is not clear.¹

- g) Heb. הקטיל, Bibl. Aram. הקטל; Arab. أَقْتَلَ, Syr. ܐܩܬܠ, Eth. አቀጥሉ here we have two different causative particles.²
- h) Loan words; *h* is sometimes prefixed to borrowed words beginning with a vowel, possibly an attempt to represent initial vowel without glottal catch, e. g., Heb. הֵיכָל, Bib. Aram. הֵיכָל, Syr. ܗܝܬܠ from Ass. *êkallu* (Sum. *e-gal*) Jew. Aram. הפריקי from Greek Ἀφρικύ.³
- i) There are a number of nouns and verbs having *h* in one language and ' in another, e. g.,

Syriac ܥܠܡܐ Arabic إبل 'herd of camels'

Hebrew הפך 'turn' Arabic أَفَلَ 'change'

Arabic سَهَفَ 'thirst' Hebrew שָׁאַף 'gasp after,' etc.

In each case one form presents the original consonant, and the other form is probably modified as the result of some special analogical influence which is often not apparent.

There is a decided tendency among Semitic grammarians towards explaining all interchange in sounds as the result of a phonetic change, ignoring wholly or in part the important role played by analogy in every living speech. That many of the interchanges herein discussed are not the result of phonetic change has, I think, been well established. It is not unlikely that a closer study of many other sporadic changes of vowels and consonants would yield similar results.

II. The Etymology of the Aramaic particle אֵית, אֵית.

One of the most important of the Semitic particles is the one that appears in Hebrew as וְ, in Assyrian as *išu*, in Arabic as

¹ A similar *i* is found in many demonstrative adverbs, cf. Brockelmann *Grundriss*, vol. i, § 108 *passim*.

² Cf. Brockelmann, *Grundriss*, vol. i, p. 520 G. Phenician יקטל probably represents the form אקטל i. e., 'iqtil < 'aqtil, the syllable 'i being written with *i* somewhat as in Syriac forms like ܝܕܐ 'hand' (pronounced *îdâ*), cf. *op. cit.*, p. 525 top.

³ Cf. Brockelmann, *op. cit.*, p. 243, Anm.

لَيْسَ = *la-isa*, all used under certain conditions to render the verb 'to be'. With these particles the Biblical Aramaic אִיִּי. Syr. ܐܝܝ are regularly identified, the *š* being considered *š*¹ (= Aram. *t*, Arab. *th*), and the *s* of Arabic لَيْسَ being explained as due to irregular sound change.¹ The difficulty presented by the initial consonant, which is ' in Hebrew and Arabic, and probably also in Assyrian, but ʾ in Aramaic, has been consistently passed over as of no moment, as an instance of a sound change which is often found in Semitic, in spite of the fact that no such phonetic law as Aram. ʾ = Heb. and Arab. ' can be shown to exist.

The particles שׁ" and ܐܝܝ, however, are probably not identical. The *š* of שׁ" is not to be considered *š*¹ but *š*², like *š* in לִשְׁאֹנוּ, *lišānu*, لَيْسَانُ. The particle ܐܝܝ is best identified with Hebrew אִי, the *nota accusativi*, the difference in meaning being such as could easily develop in the case of particles of a pronominal character, and the only other difference between the two being in the quantity of the vowel, as Hebrew *ē* is a secondary development of short *i*. Both שׁ" and אִי with their related forms are apparently the result of the combination of shorter particles of a demonstrative character, originally perhaps four in number, viz., *iâ*, 'i or 'î, *t*, *š*³, which were combined in various ways to make *notae accusativi* or quasi-verbs = "to be".²

While it is impossible of course to unwind with certainty the tangled skein of phonetic and analogical changes that the various forms of שׁ" and אִי present, the following suggestions may help to throw some light on the matter.³

Originally the demonstrative particles *iâ* and 'i were combined with both *t* and *š*, viz., *iâ-t*, *iâ-š*, 'i-*t*, 'i-*š*, all used in a general demonstrative sense.⁴ When these particles stood before pro-

¹ Cf. Professor Haupt's note on pp. 50, 51 of Müller and Kautzsch, *The Book of Proverbs* (= SBOT, 15), Leipzig, 1901; and Brockelmann, *Grundriss d. vergl. Gram. d. semitischen Sprachen*, vol. i, p. 235 θ.

² In Barth, *Pronominalbildung*, Leipzig, 1913, p. 95, this explanation is given for the various accusative particles, but not for שׁ".

³ For some examples of the workings of analogy in the case of pronouns, cf. my *Contributions to Comparative Philippine Grammar*, JAOS, vol. xxvii, 1906, pp. 337—396 *passim*.

⁴ In South Semitic 'i and 'iâ are combined to make similar demonstrative words, viz., Arabic لَيْسَ ('iîâ < 'i-iâ), Ethiopic ከደ (kîîâ from 'i-iâ

nominal suffixes, the long vowels being in open syllables were retained; when they were used before nouns the long vowels, thus standing in closed syllables, were shortened, giving rise to the forms, *'iat*, *iaš*, *'it*, *'iš*. Finally the series of forms with initial *i*, viz., *'iât*, *iâš*, *iat*, *iaš*, and the series of forms with initial *'*, viz., *'it*, *'iš*, *'it*, *'iš*, mutually influenced one another, so that we have a third series of forms resulting from analogy, viz., *'ât*, *'âš*, *'at*, *'aš*, *iât*, *iâš*, *iit*, *iış*. It is by no means necessary of course to suppose that all of these forms were actually made, but all of them are certainly possible.

The form **iât* is found in Assyrian in the oblique forms of the personal pronouns *iâti* etc., where the *t* is always followed by a vowel and *â* is hence preserved. In Aramaic ܐܝܬ we have the same form, the long vowel being preserved here in a closed syllable following the analogy of the forms with suffix, e. g., ܐܝܬܐ where it stands in an open syllable.¹ The Aramaic particle *uât*, which occurs in the Hadad inscription, in Modern Syriac, and in the Syriac prepositions ܐܝܬܐ , ܐܝܬܐ , ܐܝܬܐ ,² is probably a special modification of **iât*, perhaps developed originally after a verbal form ending in *û*, *-û-iât* > *-û-uât*.

The form **iâš* is found in the Assyrian oblique cases of the personal pronouns, viz., *iâši*, etc., under the same conditions as *iât*.

with initial *k* of uncertain origin). The particle *'i* seems to occur alone as a *nota accusativi* in Syriac imperfects with suffix of 3 sg., e. g., ܐܝܬܐܝܬܐ 'he will kill her'. The particle *t* alone has the same force in Mehri, e. g., *qabham-t-ey* 'they dishonored me'. Cf. Barth, *Pronominalbildung*, pp. 91—95; Brockelmann, *Grundriss*, vol. i, p. 315.

The particle *š* seems to occur without combination with other demonstrative particle in the first and second persons of ܐܝܬܐ 'is not', e. g., ܐܝܬܐܝܬܐ , which are perhaps based on a form ܐܝܬܐ * composed of negative *lâ* + *š* demonstrative, just as ܐܝܬܐ 'is not' is made up of negative *lâ* + demonstrative particle *t*; cf. Lane, *Arabic-English Lexicon*, London, 1863-93, vol. 7, p. 2683, cols. 1 and 2; Wright-DeGoeje, *Arabic Grammar*, Cambridge, 1896-98, vol. 1, p. 96, rem. *b*, vol. 2, p. 105, rem. *e*; contrast Brockelmann, *op. cit.* p. 190 b a.

¹ Long vowels in originally closed syllables are not uncommon in Aramaic, uniforming analogy being responsible in most cases as here, cf. Brockelmann, *Grundriss*, vol. i, p. 64 r.

² Cf. Barth, *Pronominalbildung*, p. 95.

The form **î*t occurs in Aramaic אִיתִי, אִיתִי, אִי (perhaps also in Punic *yth*), the long *î* being retained in the forms ending in a consonant before nouns, after the analogy of the forms with suffixes, e. g., אִי־ךָ etc., as in the case of אִי above.

The form **îš* has apparently been preserved in Hebrew שִׁי (II Sam. 14, 19; Mi. 6, 10; Prov. 18, 24) used in the same sense as שִׁי, tho why the vowel is not shortened in the closed syllable is not clear.¹

In the second series of forms with short vowels, **iat*, **iaš* have apparently not been preserved. The form **î*t is found in Hebrew אִתִּי (*i* being changed to *ē* under the influence of the accent). The form **îš* is perhaps to be found in Syriac ܐܝܫ, ܐܝܫܐ, pl. ܐܝܫܐ, 'matter, thing', and in Arabic أُسَّ (أَسَّ, أُسَّ) 'foundation, basis' (but cf. Ass. *uššû*),² possibly also in Assyrian *išu* (see below).

In the series of analogical forms, 'âš, 'at, 'aš,³ *î*t, *îš* apparently do not occur. The form **ât* is represented by Hebrew אִתִּי which is used only with pronominal suffix, the long vowel (*ô* for original *â*) thus always standing in an open syllable.⁴ The form **î*t occurs perhaps in Arabic لَيْتَ 'would that' (*laîta* < *lâ-îit-a*; *la* = verily, *îit* 'that', *a* adverbial ending).⁵ The form **îš* is found in Hebrew שִׁי (< *îš*), Arabic لَيْسَ (*laîša*

¹ It is not impossible that Heb. שִׁי 'man', which has no etymology, is ultimately derived from this demonstrative form. Egypt. *z* (formerly read *s*) 'man' is identified by Prof. Sethe (so Dr. Ember informs me) with the demonstratives, Arab. ذُو, Heb. הוּא, etc.; on the other hand Lithuanian *pats* originally 'lord, husband' means now 'he himself'. So it would seem not beyond the bounds of possibility that a word meaning 'that one' used by wives of their husbands should come to have the meaning of 'husband, man'.

² Cf. Payne-Smith, *Thesaurus Syriacus*, Oxonii, 1868—1901, vol. i, p. 403, col. 1; and Lane, *Arabic-English Lexicon*, vol. i, p. 56, cols. 1 and 2.

³ If it were not for the fact that many Arabic words have forms with all three vowels *a*, *i*, *u* without difference of meaning أُسَّ might be regarded as derived from the form 'âš.

⁴ The Hebrew אִתִּי. Syriac ܐܝܬܝ 'sign' are perhaps ultimately identical with the particle 'ât.

⁵ Contrast Brockelmann, *Grundriss*, vol. 1, p. 137 c.

< *lâ-iš-a*; *lâ* 'not', *iš* 'that', *a* verbal ending),¹ and probably also in Assyrian *išu* (< *išu*) stem of the verb *išû*.

Where the Phœnician *nota accusativi* אִית is to be placed is not clear. Probably it is the same form as Old Aramaic אִית (i. e., 'i-i-â t).² Later Punic *yth* may be a contraction of this form or a representative of the form *'it (see above). Phen. אִת without ' may be simply a careless spelling for אִית. Assyrian *attu* used before pronominal suffixes to make emphatic possessive pronouns is also problematical.³

III. The Multiplicative Numerals in Aramaic and Hebrew.

In the Aramaic dialects the multiplicative numerals are expressed by הַר 'one' followed by the cardinal in the form used with masculine nouns, e. g., הַר שְׁבַעַה 'seven-fold'; in Syriac the cardinal may also be preceded by the preposition ܐܝܢ, e. g., ܐܝܢ ܬܝܢ, ܐܝܢ ܫܒܥܝܢ 'two fold'.

In these constructions the הַר before the simple numerals is to be considered a construct state, the expressions meaning 'a two-fold one,' 'a seven-fold one', etc. The expressions may be used adverbially, e. g.,

הַר שְׁבַעַה 'seven times' (Dan. 3, 19).

ܐܝܢ ܬܝܢ 'double' (Ex. 22, 7).

ܐܝܢ ܫܒܥܝܢ 'seven-fold' (Gen. 4, 24).

or substantively or adjectively; e. g.,

עַל הַר ܬܝܢ 'on the basis of a double one, double' (Onkelos, Ex. 22, 3).

ܐܝܢ ܬܝܢ ܬܝܢ 'a double break' (Jer. 17, 18).

In Syriac, the construction with ܐܝܢ is apparently later than the one without. The meaning of the original construction here

¹ The form أَيْسَ which occurs as an affirmative of لَيْسَ in such expressions as مِنْ حَيْثُ أَيْسَ وَلَيْسَ, مِنْ أَيْسَ وَلَيْسَ 'from where he is or is not', (cf. Lane, *op. cit.*, vol. vii, p. 2685, cols. 1 and 2) is probably some form like 'is or 'is (< 'is or 'is) changed to 'ais thru analogy with the diphthong *ai* in *laisa*.

² Cf. Barth, *Pronominalbildung*, p. 94.

³ Cf. *op. cit.* pp. 23, 95.

is becoming dim, and the force is freshened up by the use of פּ , probably in the sense of 'multiplied by.'

In Hebrew the multiplicatives so far as they are not rendered by a circumlocution with a noun meaning 'time', are ordinarily expressed by a form ending in *-aim*,¹ but in a few passages we have a construction that is exactly the same as the Aramaic idiom just discussed. This is the construct chain פִּי שְׁנַיִם 'a face of two, two faced, two sided, two-fold' which occurs three times used as a substantive meaning 'a double portion' followed by the preposition בְּ used partitively, e. g.,

$\text{וְיִהְיֶה־נָּא פִּי־שְׁנַיִם בְּרוּחַךְ אֵלַי}$ 'let me have a double portion of thy spirit' (II Ki. 2, 9 cf. Dt. 21, 17).

$\text{פִּי שְׁנַיִם בָּהּ יִכָּרְתוּ}$ 'a double portion, two parts, of it shall be cut off' (Zech. 13, 8).

IV. Mixed Constructions in Hebrew and Aramaic.

A great deal has been written about the modification of separate words and forms resulting from the influence of other words or forms which have some point in common with them, in other words, about analogical changes in the domain of morphology (e. g., Heb. אַנֹכִי *ānôkî* for **ānôku* = Ass. *anâku*, under influence of suffix *-î* 'my', etc.) but little, so far as I know, has been written about changes in construction due to the influence of analogy.

Generally speaking such changes take place when the same idea or similar ideas may be expressed by different constructions. Here in many cases a new construction or constructions may arise consisting of a mixture of the original constructions.

Examples of such mixture in English are, e. g.,

explain it to (mixture of *explain it by* and *ascribe it to*) :
in order not to avoid (mixture of *not to have* and *to avoid*) ;
to hear to a thing (mixture of *to hear a thing* and *to listen to a thing*) :

put on the same equal (mixture of *put on the same level*,
put on an equality, *make equal*) ; etc. etc.

The object of the present paper is to point out some examples of a similar character in Hebrew and Aramaic.

¹ Cf. my paper, *The dual ending -aim in the Hebrew multiplicative numerals*, *AJSL*, vol. 33, no. 2 (Jan., 1917), pp. 148, 149.

(1)

In Hebrew the ordinal numerals are usually expressed either by the ordinal used as an adjective, or by the cardinal in the genitive after the noun, e. g.,

בִּשְׁנָה הַתְּשִׁיעִית }
בִּשְׁנַת תִּשְׁעַת } 'in the ninth year'.

It is possible, however, to say also

בִּשְׁנַת הַתְּשִׁיעִית 'in the ninth year' (II Ki. 25, 1; 17, 6).

Here we have a mixture of the two constructions above, the speaker or writer beginning with one and ending with the other. This construction occurs also in Jer. 46, 2; 51, 59; 28, 1 *Kt.* (4th): Ezr. 7, 8 (7th): Jer. 32, 1 *Kt.* (10th).

(2)

In Hebrew after an oath the statement that is emphasized is introduced sometimes by כִּי 'verily', sometimes by אִם 'if'. כִּי is the proper particle for example after חֵי יְהוָה 'as the Lord lives', אִם the proper particle for example after כֹּה יַעֲשֶׂה יְהוָה כֹּה 'the Lord do so to . . .', e. g.,

אִתָּהּ כִּי יֵשֶׁר אַתָּה 'as the Lord liveth, thou art upright' (I Sam. 29, 6; cf. 14, 39).

כֹּה יַעֲשֶׂה יְהוָה לְךָ אִם-תִּכְחַד מִמֶּנִּי דְבָר 'the Lord do so to thee . . . if thou hide anything from me' (I Sam. 3, 17).

Constructions like אִם חֵי יְהוָה and כִּי כֹה יַעֲשֶׂה יְהוָה are due to a mixture of the two constructions above, חֵי יְהוָה and כֹּה יַעֲשֶׂה יְהוָה having come to be regarded as equivalent expressions, e. g.,

אִם-אֶקַּח חֵי-יְהוָה 'as the Lord liveth [= may the Lord punish me] if I take it' (II Ki. 5, 16; cf. II Sam. 11. 11; I Sam. 14, 45).

כֹּה יַעֲשֶׂה יְהוָה לִי כִּי הָמוּת יִפְרִיר בִּנִי וּבִנָּהּ 'the Lord do so to me . . . [= I solemnly swear] only death shall part me and thee' (Ru. 1, 17; cf. I Sam. 14, 44; I Ki. 2, 23).

From such sentences as those in the first example אִם develops the meaning of a negative after any oath or asseveration and

its negative **אִם-לֹא** the force of a strong affirmative.¹ These particles therefore often replace the conjunction **אֲשֶׁר** or **כִּי** 'that' after a verb or phrase meaning 'swear', and the preposition **מִן** after the expression "**חֲלִילָה ל'** 'far be it from . . . to', e. g.,

וְנִכְרְתָה בְרִית עִמָּךְ אִם-תַּעֲשֶׂה עִמָּנוּ רָעָה 'and let us make a covenant with thee [that] thou wilt not hurt us' (Gen. 26, 28—29; cf. Gen. 14, 23; 21, 23; I Sam. 3, 14; Dt. 1, 34f.; **אִם-לֹא** Gen. 24, 37;² Is. 14, 24).³

הֲלִילָה לִי אִם אֲבָלַע וְאִם אֲשָׁחִית 'far be it from me to swallow up or destroy' (II Sam. 20, 20; cf. Job 27, 5).⁴

(3)

In Biblical Aramaic the construction—

וּבָעוּ דָנִיֵּאל וְחִבְרוּהִי לְהַתְקַטֵּלָהּ 'and they sought Daniel and his companions to kill them' (Dan. 2, 13)

is apparently the result of a mixture of ideas. The same idea might be expressed by the following constructions, viz.:

וּבָעוּ דָנִיֵּאל וְחִבְרוּהִי לְהַתְקַטֵּלָהּ 'they sought to kill D. and his companions',
וּבָעוּ דָנִיֵּאל וְחִבְרוּהִי לְהַתְקַטֵּלָהּ 'they sought D. and his companions to kill them',

וּבָעִי דָנִיֵּאל וְחִבְרוּהִי לְהַתְקַטֵּלָהּ 'D. and his companions were sought to be killed'.

Now the active plural of a verb is often used in the sense of a passive, so the writer of the passage, after beginning the sentence in the active construction, felt the phrase "**וּבָעוּ דָנִיֵּאל וְחִבְרוּהִי**" as the equivalent of "**וּבָעִי דָנִיֵּאל וְחִבְרוּהִי**" and so finished the sentence according to the passive construction.

¹ From this use is derived the use of these particles as independent adverbs meaning 'not' and 'verily', cf. Gesenius-Kautzsch, *Heb. Gram.*²⁸ § 149 e.

² Contrast with Gen. 24, 3 where **אֲשֶׁר** is used after **הַשְׁבִּיעַ**.

³ In the last three examples **אִם** and **לֹא** are preceded by **לֵאמֹר** e. g., in the first, **וְיִשְׁבַּע לֵאמֹר אִם**. Such cases form a transition category between the other examples and those cases in which the particles are used as independent adverbs in independent clauses, cf. n. 1.

⁴ For examples of **מִן** after **חֲלִילָה ל'** cf. Gen. 18, 25; 44, 7; 17; Jos. 24, 16.

(4)

In Biblical Aramaic a final clause may be expressed just as in Hebrew either by ܠ + infinitive or by ܝ + finite verb, e. g.,

מִן־שָׁם לָכֶם מַעֲם בִּיתָא דְּנָה לְבָנָא ‘who commanded you to build this house?’ (Ezr. 5, 3).

‘therefore tell me the dream that I may know that . . .’ Dan. 2, 9).

In three passages we have what seems to be a mixture of the two constructions, e. g.,

and he asked “ד' זמן ינתן-לה ופֿשרא להחיותה למלכא that time be given to him that he might make known the interpretation to the king” (Dan. 2, 16).

Here **וּפִשְׂרָא לְהַחְוִיָּה לְמַלְכָּא** is a mixture of

and פֶּשֶׁרָא לַחַיִּיָּה לְמַלְכָּא

וּפִּשְׂרָא יִהְיֶה לְמַלְכָּא

Cf. also Dan. 2, 18; 5, 15.¹

The same mixed construction is found in Hebrew, especially in late passages, e. g., וְלָתֶת 'in order to give' Ex. 32, 29; וְלִיְיָרֵם 'in order to educate them' (Dan. 1, 5), etc.²

Similarly in Syriac, where ܐܝܢܐ + infinitive and ܐܝܢܐ + finite verb are equivalent final constructions, we find occasionally final clauses in which the verb is in the infinitive after ܐܝܢܐ introduced by the final conjunction ܐܝܢܐ ,³ e. g.,

١. رُحْمَةٌ يُفْتَدَى بِهَا خَبِيرَةٌ تَأْمُرُ خَيْرًا مِنْ رُحْمَةٍ

‘if thou desirest to learn these things with diligence.’

¹ Contrast Torrey, *Notes on the Aramaic Part of Daniel*, Transactions of the Connecticut Academy of Arts and Sciences, vol. xv, July, 1909, p. 257.

² Cf. Gesenius-Kautzsch, *Heb. Gram.*²⁸ § 114 p.

³ Cf. Nöldeke, *Syriac Grammar* (transl. by Crichton), London, 1904, § 286.